



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,419	10/06/2000	Nobuhiro Suetsugu	Q60879	1278
7590 01/26/2005 SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20037-3213			EXAMINER NGUYEN, NHON D	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/680,419

Applicant(s)

SUETSUGU ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2179

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-15

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

Heather R. Harrison
HEATHER R. HARRISON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

As per claim 9, according to Hansen, the network device configuration tool 10 generates a configuration manager GUI 100 (see fig. 4) which provides a network workspace 102 and a device window 104 (col. 9, lines 25-52). Therefore, it is clearly "a controller", as recited by the claim language. Router or a computer subsystem controlled by the tool 10 is clearly a device. It is further notice that the claim does not claim the limitations such as "input signal", "output signal", "count value", "timer value" and "numerical data" in its claim language. Furthermore, an exemplary network configuration map 106 (fig. 7), for example, clearly teaches "a display drafting information".

As per claims 13 and 14, As in fig. 3B, the step of selecting device 60 is done before the step of configuring that device 96-99. Therefore, whenever Hansen's system saves data such as display drafting information or device selection information, the processes of setting up the display drafting information and selecting device of the controller must be paused (or interrupted) for a period of time to allow the data to be saved completely before they can continue.

As per claim 15, it is clearly in Hansen's system that GUI 100 (fig. 4) is a display drafting and the network device configuration tool 10 (fig. 1B) generates a control program to configure a router or a computer subsystem (col. 9, lines 25-52).

As per claim 1, Hansen clearly teaches "means for setting up a display drafting information" in 66-99 of fig. 3B and fig. 4 - fig. 6.

As per claim 4, Hansen does teaches in figs. 4 and 7 (col. 9, lines 25-52) "sharing the appended comment between the display drafting apparatus and the control program schema generator", for example, the text that comments about a router or a computer subsystem in fig. 4.

As per claims 7 and 8, Hansen does teach drafting display information for the device or a control program for the selected device as shown above; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Hansen reference with Applicant admitted prior art's drafting display information system since it would have divided the processing jobs between modules and made the system run faster.